

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/658,726	BUCO ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	MENGYAO ZHE	2195	

  

**All Participants:**

(1) MENGYAO ZHE.

(2) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 1 July 2008

**Type of Interview:**

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant    ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes    ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*103 rejections for claims 1, 7-11, 13, 14, 20-24 using Atif et al and Baker et al were discussed.*

Claims discussed:

*1, 7-11, 13-15, 20-24*

Prior art documents discussed:

*NPL: To Schedule or to Execute, by Atif et al and Baker et al, Pub. No. US 2005/0065826*

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

**Status of Application:** Pending

(3) Vicky Ash.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Claim 1 is still unclear in terms of how the solutions found by different algorithms are used for scheduling and resource allocation purposes. Therefore, the Examiner proposed moving claims 7 and 8 up with claim 1, because these two dependent claims helps to clear up this issue. The applicant agreed with the proposal.